

Response to ‘Comments on the $U(2)$ ADHM two-instanton’

N. B. Pomeroy

*Theoretical Physics Division, Department of Mathematical Sciences,
University of Liverpool, Liverpool, L69 3BX, U.K.*

`nbp@amtp.liv.ac.uk`

Abstract

We respond to ‘Comments on the $U(2)$ ADHM two-instanton’ [Y. Tian, Phys. Lett. B **566** (2003) 183].

The author of [1] claims that for $N = 2$ the $U(N)$ two-instanton gauge field configuration given in [2] by explicitly resolving the ADHM instanton constraints [3, 4] is incorrect. In response, we highlight some of the shortcomings of the $U(2)$ ADHM two-instanton solution presented in [1], and re-examine the $U(2)$ ADHM two-instanton solution which we presented in [2] in view of the comments upon it given in [1].

Firstly, the $U(2)$ two-instanton solution presented in [1] does not take into account the fact that the full auxiliary symmetry of the $U(2)$ ADHM construction with topological charge $k = 2$ is $U(2)$ and not $SU(2)$. The $SU(2)$ factor within the global $U(2) \simeq U(1) \times SU(2)$ transformations which must be performed to fix the auxiliary symmetry is accounted for, but the $U(1)$ factor is not. The $U(1)$ factor within the $U(2)$ global gauge transformations will act trivially upon the submatrix a' consisting of the submatrices B_1 and B_2 , in the notation of [1]. However, the $U(1)$ factor may act upon the submatrices I and J of the $U(2)$ ADHM two-instanton solution presented in [1] non-trivially. This is not addressed, nor accounted for, for the $U(2)$ ADHM two-instanton solution presented in [1], as only the action of the $SU(2)$ transformation upon the submatrices I and J is considered, as in Eq. (6) of [1]. The aforementioned global $U(1)$ gauge transformations which should act upon the submatrices of the $U(2)$ ADHM two-instanton solution presented in [1] may add additional parameters to the that solution, thereby making the $U(2)$ ADHM two-instanton solution presented in [1] a special, rather than general, solution. An explicit form for the global gauge transformation used to fix the $U(2)$ auxiliary symmetry of the $U(2)$ ADHM two-instanton presented in [2] was given in [2], which included both the action of the $SU(2)$ factor and of the $U(1)$ factor within the $U(2)$ group upon all of the ADHM submatrices of the ADHM matrix a .

Secondly, we consider the contradiction alleged by the author of [1] to be present in the $U(2)$ ADHM two-instanton solution presented in [2]. Equations (35) and (46) of [2] are not necessarily in contradiction. Rather, given the form of the $U(2)$ ADHM two-instanton submatrices in Eqs. (47,48) of [2], where the $U(2)$ auxiliary symmetry has been fixed, if one demands consistency between these equations and the form of the fixed $U(2)$ auxiliary symmetry as given in the Appendix of [2], so that $U_1 < 0$ (we note that $U_1 > 0$ is not permitted, in order that the $U(2)$ two-instanton solution with $U(2)$ auxiliary symmetry fixed as in [2] is a valid solution), one derives the following condition upon the parameters contained within the $U(2)$ -auxiliary symmetry-fixed $U(2)$ ADHM two-instanton solution in [2]:

$$\frac{2|x_0|^2}{(|x_0|^2 + |x_1|^2)|x_1|^2} [\bar{x}_0 x_1 U_2 U_z + x_0 \bar{x}_1 \bar{U}_2 \bar{U}_z] > 0. \quad (1)$$

The inequality in Eq. (1) is specific to the $U(2)$ ADHM two-instanton with the $U(2)$ symmetry fixed as in [2], and does not constitute a generic defect of the $N = 2$ case of the $U(N)$ ADHM two-instanton solution given in [2], as there exist choices of transformations other than those in the Appendix of [2] with which to fix the $U(2)$ auxiliary symmetry when $N = 2$. For the specific choice of transformations used to fix the $U(2)$ auxiliary

symmetry given in the Appendix of [2], we admit that the inequality in Eq. (1) does represent an additional constraint upon the parameters of the $U(2)$ ADHM two-instanton solution, so that the parameters in this particular form of the solution are not completely independent. However, Eq. (1) does not reduce the number of parameters in the solution as it is an inequality. The inequality in Eq. (1) serves as a bound on the parameters in the solution, but the $U(2)$ ADHM two-instanton solution in [2] is still parameterized by sixteen real parameters. In physical applications, this bound may naturally be satisfied. We maintain that other choices of transformations which fix the auxiliary $U(2)$ symmetry of the $N = 2$ solution exist which do not create the bound in Eq. (1). Hence there is no contradiction, only a bound imposed upon the parameters of the solution.

Thirdly, the quantity $|x|^2$ defined in Eq. (33) of [2] was not specified by us in [2] as the separation between the two constituent one-instantons of the $U(N)$ ADHM two-instanton solution in [2]. The quantity $|x|^2$ was defined only for convenience, and we note that in the original paper [2], a typographical error was made. In agreement with the author of [1], the quantity $|x|^2$ should be defined as:

$$|x|^2 \equiv |x_0|^2 + |x_1|^2, \quad (2)$$

for which the solution presented in [2] does indeed satisfy the ADHM constraints for gauge group $U(N)$ and $k = 2$. Equation (2) above corrects Eq. (33) of [2]. The quantity $|x|$ is the separation to be expected between two points located at $(-\frac{1}{2}x_0, -\frac{1}{2}x_1)$ and $(\frac{1}{2}x_0, \frac{1}{2}x_1)$ on a flat Euclidean complex space of complex dimension two, in accordance with the form of the submatrices specifying the general $U(N)$ ADHM two-instanton given in Eqs. (38,39) of [2]. Therefore the quantity $|x|^2$ is indeed associated with the separation between the two constituent $U(N)$ ADHM one-instanton solutions within the $U(N)$ ADHM two-instanton configuration given in [2]. We thank the author of [1] for bringing this typographical error to our attention.

Fourthly, we examine the dilute instanton gas limit, also known as the completely clustered limit, of the $U(2)$ ADHM two-instanton solution presented in [1]. In Eq. (14) of [1], the author of [1] obtains the dilute instanton gas limit by taking the separation between the constituent $U(2)$ ADHM one-instantons to infinity. We assume that the ADHM submatrix a in Eq. (14) of [1] represents the ADHM data of a general $U(2)$ ADHM two-instanton solution of arbitrary $U(2)$ gauge iso-orientation. However, one of the $U(2)$ ADHM one-instanton submatrices within the decomposition in Eq. (14) does not possess an arbitrary $U(2)$ gauge iso-orientation: in the notation of [1], the parameters $\{l, m, \theta\}$, which presumably should also be present to specify the $SU(2)$ gauge iso-orientation of the $U(2)$ ADHM one-instantons, assume special values for one of the $U(2)$ ADHM one-instantons. In contrast, the other $U(2)$ ADHM one-instanton submatrix possesses arbitrary $SU(2)$ gauge iso-orientation parameters $\{l, m, \theta\}$. Furthermore, this implies that one of the one-instanton submatrices contains fewer parameters than the other one-instanton submatrix, which should not be the case. (The total number

of real parameters for the $U(2)$ auxiliary-symmetry-fixed $U(2)$ ADHM two-instanton is sixteen. Within the dilute instanton gas limit, the two constituent $U(2)$ ADHM one-instanton solutions which arise should possess eight parameters each.) The $U(2)$ ADHM two-instanton solution presented in [2] does not exhibit this deficiency in the number of parameters when the dilute instanton gas limit is taken. Moreover, the $U(2)$ ADHM two-instanton solution in [2] possesses an arbitrary $U(2)$ gauge iso-orientation, which remains arbitrary, though possibly correlated, for each of the two $U(2)$ ADHM one-instanton solutions in the dilute instanton gas limit. In this way, both of the constituent $U(2)$ ADHM one-instantons obtained in the dilute instanton gas limit of the $U(2)$ ADHM two-instanton solution in [2] each possess their own $U(2)$ gauge iso-orientations and the correct number of real parameters for general $U(2)$ ADHM one-instantons.

The author of [1] also considers the 't Hooft limit for the $U(2)$ ADHM two-instanton solution presented in [1], in which the constituent $U(2)$ ADHM one-instantons possess the same gauge iso-orientation. It is not clear how one can take the 't Hooft limit for the $U(2)$ ADHM two-instanton solution presented in [2]. This is because the physical interpretation of the parameters within the solution is not sufficiently complete to enable one to specify that the two constituent one-instantons in the solution possess the same gauge iso-orientation. However, we believe that this does not indicate that the $U(N)$ ADHM two-instanton solution given in [2] is incorrect. The complexity of the $U(N)$ ADHM two-instanton solution given in [2] does not yet permit a completely transparent identification of the gauge iso-orientation parameters within it, though, as explained in [2], they are contained within the ADHM submatrices u_1 and u_2 used in the $U(N)$ ADHM two-instanton solution presented in [2]. The general formalism for $U(N)$ ADHM multi-instantons developed in [5] is expected to permit such an identification in future. We therefore cannot yet comment on the 't Hooft limit of the $U(2)$ ADHM two-instanton solution presented in [2]. Currently, there is no evidence that the 't Hooft limit does not exist for the $U(2)$ ADHM two-instanton solution presented in [2].

We maintain that the $U(N)$ ADHM two-instanton solution given in [2] is correct. Any discrepancies for the case $N = 2$, as claimed by the author of [1], are due to the choice made in [2] for the fixing of the $U(2)$ auxiliary symmetry, which is required to render the solution physical. Since these choices are arbitrary and not unique, we presume that other global $U(2)$ gauge transformations may be performed so that any such discrepancies can be removed. However, finding such transformations in order to do this is a difficult task, which we intend to address elsewhere.

Acknowledgements

We wish to acknowledge helpful discussions with Prof. D. R. T. Jones and Dr. I. Jack.

References

- [1] Y. Tian, Phys. Lett. B **566** (2003) 183.
- [2] N. B. Pomeroy, Phys. Lett. B **547** (2002) 85 [arXiv:hep-th/0203184].
- [3] M. F. Atiyah, N. J. Hitchin, V. G. Drinfeld and Y. I. Manin, Phys. Lett. A **65** (1978) 185.
- [4] E. Corrigan, D. B. Fairlie, S. Templeton and P. Goddard, Nucl. Phys. B **140** (1978) 31,
N. H. Christ, E. J. Weinberg and N. K. Stanton, Phys. Rev. D **18** (1978) 2013.
- [5] V. V. Khoze, M. P. Mattis and M. J. Slater, Nucl. Phys. B **536** (1998) 69 [arXiv:hep-th/9804009],
N. Dorey, T. J. Hollowood, V. V. Khoze, M. P. Mattis and S. Vandoren, Nucl. Phys. B **552** (1999) 88 [arXiv:hep-th/9901128],
N. Dorey, T. J. Hollowood, V. V. Khoze and M. P. Mattis, Phys. Rept. **371** (2002) 231 [arXiv:hep-th/0206063].